

able to answer or find someone who had an answer. They have a network of support groups that work with the various relatives of brain tumor victims.

I know that since I have been in Congress at least two of my colleagues, who I considered very good friends, Paul Henry and also Mike Synar, unfortunately died from brain tumors. I just wanted to take a little time tonight to recognize the American Brain Tumor Association for the dedication and service to patients and families with brain tumors. They provide information to their members with the latest medical breakthroughs available on brain tumor treatments. In addition, they furnish information on support services to help families deal with the issues that they face when a loved one is found with a brain tumor.

While the association has done a lot, there is a lot more that can be done, Mr. Speaker. As Congress determines the fiscal year 1999 spending priorities, funding for research needs our continued support.

I am committed to the doubling of the National Institutes of Health funding increase for 1999 and urge every Member of Congress to do the same. Every dollar that we commit to lifesaving treatment oriented and basic research is an investment that will have an enormous return in terms of saving and improving lives, as well as saving health care dollars in the future.

I just wanted to say tonight, in closing, to the American Brain Tumor Association, thank you for a job well done over the last 25 years. To my colleagues in Congress, I say, we still have a lot that we must do.

□ 2315

VALUES OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for the balance of the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I first want to compliment the previous speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), on his thoughts and ideas about health care and the proposals that he has set forward. And we certainly look forward to learning about those proposals and possibly working to provide our opinions and thoughts and perhaps assistance in moving in a very similar direction of caring and compassion for those who are so afflicted.

But proposals seem to be few and far between here in Washington with respect to a number of issues that we have been dealing with in recent days and in recent weeks. And we, as the Republican party in Congress, have been fighting very passionately and forcefully about issues and proposals that

are designed to help the American taxpayer, to help the American family to unleash our economy and allow for a greater prosperity throughout the country.

And with this in mind, let me yield a few moments to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased by the fact that he joins me in this Chamber tonight along another newcomer to Washington, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. Speaker, as I was listening to the earlier portion and presentation offered by our friend in the minority, I could not help but think of three dates, two occurring in this month and another that will come in October.

We should note for the calendar that this is the 1st of April. And while I doubt no one's sincerity, the absurdity of some of the comments which preceded us in the minority Special Order I guess should be tempered by the fact that this is, in fact, April Fool's Day. And we know that that is the second favorite holiday in the minority's calendar, because the minority party and those always tied to the culture of spend and spend and spend some more really have as their favorite holiday April 15, when everyone must send in their tax returns.

And for evidence, despite a frantic effort to get away from words that were read in the RECORD here last week, my friends, my colleagues and, Mr. Speaker, the citizens who join us beyond these walls via television should look to this quote and understand all the frantic posturing and postmortems cannot change what was said on this floor. The Chief Deputy Whip, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, who stood opposite in the well, said this last week, quote, the fact is that Democrats are not for tax cuts.

Now, I could amend that statement because I know a lot of common-sense folks who offer party label second in the Sixth District of Arizona who are hard-working Americans who are pleased by the tax cuts they have this year, hanging on to more of their own money to save, spend, and invest as they see fit. And in the frantic way in which the minority, the congressional folks who are tax and spenders, tried to back paddle on this statement tonight, I could not help but note that the scenario they offered brings up a third date on the calendar, October 31.

Because, sadly, it seems that the minority, so bankrupt of ideas, so bereft of new energy at times, offers what is a rhetorical terrorism to victimize the most vulnerable in our society by setting up these scenarios that can only be described as part Orwellian, part Kevorkian. And so, we heard it again tonight.

There are many positive things to talk about and to report to the American people tonight, Mr. Speaker, as the new majority continues its quest

for common-sense conservative government with the notion that the people of America should hang on to more of their own money and send less of it to Washington. And that is why I am so pleased to join my friend again from Colorado and my friend from Texas.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona.

Wednesday night is freshmen night, typically. The freshman class is one that tries to reserve an hour every Wednesday to talk about the values of our Republican party. We are joined by many other Members from other classes, senior Members, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is, who has been one that we look to for leadership and guidance, one who inspires us and who is a great colleague for us as new Members.

Our goal and objective in these Special Orders is to really draw the distinction between the two parties that are here in Washington, because it really does matter. People think that there are two parties that are somehow the same. And there are votes on occasion where our votes seem to be commingled. But, by and large, the philosophies that divide us and separate us are legitimate issues; they are legitimate cause for having two sides.

Thomas Jefferson observed 220-some-odd years ago that, in all political systems there really are two sides; there is the side that believes in more government, the side that believes that the government is the best way to organize our societies, and then there is the other side that believes that we should look to individuals and families and people as the definitive feature in establishing the character of a society or community.

Well, we, as Republicans, differ very greatly from our Democrat side, the Democrats being the side that does believe in more government and that government is the organizing factor in our society. And the quote that my colleague highlighted here is probably most indicative that I have seen in recent days about the difference between them and us.

They believe that there is no cause for tax cuts. In fact, they have worked routinely in this Congress to increase taxes to oppose every effort that we have made as the Republican party to turn more wealth away from Washington and back to the people of the country and to the States.

That philosophy of less government, more reliance on States and individuals, is something that we fight for all the time and routinely.

I want to yield, if I can, to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), who is leading this Congress with a bold plan, a bold idea, a bold proposal to rein in the size of Federal Government, the scope of our government by a responsible mechanism that is used in several States called sunset.

So, with that, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership of the freshman Republican class in 1998.

The Fourth of July is one of my favorite holidays. And this past year Kathy, my wife, and I were watching fireworks over a lake in my community in Woodlands, Texas; and I thought as I watched the fireworks this year that it was ironic that Fourth of July has two meanings for America this year. It is not only in 1997, as usual, our day of independence, but this year it was the first day most Americans started working for themselves because July 3 was what we call cost-of-government day in America.

That means that, for most American families, we work from January 1 to July 3 just to pay tax, just to pay our State, local, Federal taxes; and the cost of regulation on most families now reach to July 3. That is over half the year. That means in a lot of families we have got one parent working just to pay the bills and the rent and put food on the table, and we have another parent working just to pay their taxes.

Like my colleague, I have had the opportunity to work in State government and in city government, and I can tell my colleagues now serving the Congress that it is at the Federal level where we waste far too many of the resources we have.

Our goal in the Republican Congress is to shrink the size of Federal Government, to give more power back to the communities and, more importantly, leave them their money and resources to solve the problems and make decisions themselves. Well, big government has a life of its own, especially in Washington.

Former President Ronald Reagan said, "There is nothing closer to immortality on earth than a Federal agency." And that really is true. Our government continues to grow. And I am convinced that we can never really shrink Washington just by slowing the growth of spending. We are going to tackle and address wasteful spending, abolish obsolete agencies, and really get into duplication to give power back to our communities and our families.

Sunsetting is a simple concept, and it is proven because it is used by more than 20 States. I want to set an expiration date on every Federal agency, every program, every department, every commission, every bureau, every council where they go out of existence unless they can prove their value to us. And not what they were worth a hundred years ago, as the board of tea examiners were when they were first created, or 40 years ago or 20 years ago, but do they deserve our tax dollars today and are they needed today?

Sunsetting puts every agency up for review to take away the sacred cows, and for the first time it shifts the burden of proof. Rather than Congress and taxpayers today having to convince America that there is not a single use for an agency, it shifts that burden to the agencies to prove to American tax-

payers that they deserve our tax dollars today.

In Texas, we view sunseting over the years and in that State we have eliminated 42 State agencies and saved \$60 million for taxpayers. That is in the State. I am convinced at the Federal level we can do a hundredfold that.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And, again, I think what the gentleman from Texas advocates, Mr. Speaker, points up the vitality of our system of federalism where we can look to the States for the examples proffered there.

Now, to be certain, what works in Austin may not be readily accepted in Boston; what is embraced in Harrisburg may not always be the case in Phoenix. And yet, taking a look at what States do in terms of seizing the initiative, I know, for example, right now the State of Arizona is coming to grips with the whole notion of school funding; and they are working in the House and Senate working on those ideas. Who knows what will come from those notions?

But, again, as we have seen with welfare reform, as we have seen with so many different issues and certainly those that lend a notion of fiscal responsibility and accountability, we look to the States. And I cannot help but notice our friend from the Republic of Texas, known as the Lone Star State also, perhaps with a distinction as the sunset State, and I think he hit on something that is so vitally important because it should be our mission here; and while we do point out differences and while we celebrate differences in philosophies, the fact is that we also look for common ground across the board, across the aisle.

And we have been able to make some changes here in Washington based on those examples, perhaps not as formalized as the gentleman offers here tonight, perhaps the first halting few steps made in the 104th Congress, that historic Congress where the balance of power that the American people confer on this Chamber was changed to a common-sense conservative majority when we eliminated over 300 wasteful and duplicative programs and in the process reduced spending by some \$54 billion.

Now, to be sure, Mr. Speaker, that was just a start. Much more remains to be done. And that is why I am so enthusiastic about our colleague from Texas (Mr. BRADY) bringing this idea to this Chamber, showing again the wisdom of the notion of transferring money, power, and influence out of Washington, where sadly those resources had been wasted, and making sure that the power rests preeminently in the States.

Because in most cases, there may be some exceptions, but in most cases power closer to home, the ideas coming from home to Washington can help reinvigorate our constitutional republic. And that is the essence of what is going on. Again, it just stands in stark contrast.

My colleague from Colorado and I were in the cloakroom watching the theatrics on the other side tonight, how instead of ideas they wanted to take something that was just simply a policy notion, not even articulated in the fashion that they would bring it to the floor, but yet to market fear, they take a legitimate proposal, twist it, change it to scare people.

I would just like to see their proposals. I would just like to see some new ideas from the other side. I think they, too, should look to the States and look to the people and listen for answers.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. The gentleman hit the nail on the head. Because anybody who was observing the House floor just 20, 30 minutes ago when the left wing of the Democrat party was here speaking could see very clearly that they are in fear themselves of these ideas, these Republican ideas about changing government, lowering tax rates, constraining the size of the Federal Government. They are afraid of those ideas.

If they really do represent a philosophy, as they do, a philosophy that is constructed entirely upon the notion of power obtained through government, then any idea that threatens that power structure is a real threat to their way of life and changes life as they know it. That is a frightening notion to people who love big government. And I will tell my colleagues why. Because it does turn the tables and changes the dynamic.

Right now in Washington, as we have discovered as Members of Congress, a tremendous amount of the leverage belongs to the bureaucrats. They know they are going to stick around forever, these people in government, these bureaucrats, and my colleagues and I we are going to come here and serve a few terms and do the work that the people have sent us here to do and then we are going to go back and live in a society that we have helped create and the laws that we have cast votes upon.

□ 2330

But those bureaucrats are going to be here forever. They know, as long as they can keep the rules rigged as they are today, that their life is going to go on and on unimpeded.

What really frightens these left-wingers over on the Democrat side of the aisle is that our ideas would really force the country to ask this question: If we were to start all over again today with this program or that program, would we create it to be what it is today? And pick an agency, any topic. There is not a single agency in the Federal Government, I would submit, that this Congress would ever establish just as it is now if we started all over again. We would not do it.

You take a look at the IRS. It is volumes and volumes of absolute nonsense. Nobody would sit down and invent that system. But the reason we have it is because the rules are always in favor of the government and the bureaucrats and these policies that are

never ever challenged. And that is what sunset accomplishes.

Mr. BRADY. If I may continue on with that, I made a point about how good bureaucracies are playing the game up here. They are so much better than us citizen legislators will ever be. As you know, just in my first term, I have already observed the Washington Monument defense, which is, if you have a \$100 million agency, and you propose to cut one-tenth of 1 percent of their budget, they will immediately state those were the funds that we were going to use to keep the Washington Monument open. If you cut our budget, I guess we will just have to shut down the Washington Monument to America's visitors, which you know is ludicrous, but they are able to scare the American people.

And sunset, what I like about that, is it, not only does it target obsolete agencies and prevent them from playing budget games, but it also targets duplication. We have today, just in Washington, we have 600 different programs to aid inner cities. We have 300 different programs for economic development. Just for children at risk is a good example. For children at risk, we have 116 different Federal programs administered by 13 different agencies.

What are the chances a tax dollar will ever get to a child who really needs it. More importantly, what about the family that sacrifices from their children to send tax dollars to Washington to have it wasted to that extent.

Sunset targets that type of duplication, insists on accountability. More importantly, the State, and the gentleman from Arizona pointed out, at the State level, we know, when you sunset an agency, for about 2 years before that agency's date is up, you cannot believe how responsive they get. They start answering their mail. They are quick to return phone calls. They start to understand that they have customers to serve.

Some of them think it is the legislature who are their customers, but, in fact, it is taxpayers. But the issue of accountability begins to creep in. The good agencies already know what customer service is about. But agencies that are wasting our dollars duplicating programs that are obsolete in their mission and refuse to understand who their bosses are, they struggle under sunset. Thankfully, they ought to.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in hearing his remarks and not only taking a look at what went on in real life down in the Republic of Texas, in the Lone Star State, in that legislature how those programs have worked, I could not help but be struck upon a couple of comments he made dealing with the realities that American families confront now, not only the burden of taxation, but the hidden cost of regulation.

And lest anyone misunderstand, because I have a funny feeling in view of what some folks in this chamber say distinctly and want to come back and

amend, and certain ad campaigns that have existed in the past to take legitimate comments out of context, lest anyone misunderstand, we are not talking about the abolition of regulation. We understand a modicum of regulation, Mr. Speaker, is reasonable, rational to make sure that infrastructure and systems exist.

But what is worth noting is the fact that, when our Founders wrote the Constitution, the first three words in the beautiful preamble are "We the people". They did not write we the government.

What is unique about our system is the fact that it was, as Catherine Drinker Bowen wrote, the Miracle at Philadelphia, because our Founders devised a system, a notion that was, dare we say, at that time in history, considered by the Europeans and others, extreme for our system, was based on the notion, our constitutional republic was founded on the notion that rights are conferred upon the people by God and, in turn, the people confer rights upon the government.

So as I hear the plans that my friend from Texas brings up, it calls to mind and brings to mind a piece of legislation that my colleague the gentleman from Colorado and I cosponsor here in the House, sponsored in the other body by a former colleague in this chamber, now Senator BROWNBACK of Kansas, the Congressional Responsibility Act, another tool to use to reign in runaway regulation.

Because following the beautiful preamble to the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, in Article 1, section 1 of this great document, it reads, and I quote, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States," all legislative powers.

Yet, what we have done for the better part of this century, initially with the best of intentions, is to empower the unelected. Congress gradually in ceding that control and that authority to the executive branch has essentially, and pardon me, Mr. Speaker, and those at home, turned its back, turned its back on the American people, turned its back on the responsibilities.

So now seemingly daily in the Federal Register you have Washington bureaucrats drafting regulation, and these regulations, if they are not strictly adhered to, carry with them sanctions. Sometimes those sanctions can include fines or imprisonment, sometimes both.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not an attorney. J.D. does not stand for jurist doctorate. I think that is an asset. But you do not have to be a lawyer to realize that, in essence, what has happened is that Congress has placed lawmaking authority in the hands of the unelected.

I know my colleague from Colorado had a very interesting experience. One of his committees, he was explaining it to us, his epiphany, if you will, for the way Washington has come to work

when we are talking about the regulation railroad, and we are not talking about locomotion so much as bureaucratic inertia.

Could you share your experience on committee? Do you recall? You spoke so eloquently at our press conference about your days sitting with the ag folks, and someone came I believe from the Department of Agriculture. And it is a great, great story that stuck in my mind because you said that you leaned over to a more senior member of the committee and you said, "Wait minute. This guy is making law. He is bringing up law."

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. That is right. We were in the Committee on Agriculture talking with people from the Department of Agriculture, the regulatory bureaucrats who preside over the daily lives of farmers and ranchers and the hard-working people of America who produce our food. These bureaucrats were explaining their program, hearing Member by Member around the committee table talk about their frustration with these rules and regulations and our desire to see them change.

I leaned over to the senior Member sitting to my right at the time, and after I had finished asking some questions and speaking and raising some pointed issues with these bureaucrats, I leaned over after it was all over, and I said, you know, I said I am starting to get the feeling they do not care all that much what we have to say or think.

I remember his comment back, and he said just basically what I said before. He said that is because, after you are long gone, Mr. SCHAFFER, those bureaucrats are still going to be sitting in those chairs answering to some other people, who it is going to take them a few years to figure out that nobody cares what they have to say either. That really needs to change.

The amazing thing is, our Founders were brilliant, wise leaders who had the perception to look years out in the future. Drawing upon their learned experience and knowledge about government systems, they were able to look out and realize that we needed a system of government where the people really are in charge and acknowledging certain inalienable rights, as they said right in our Declaration, that we have these rights, life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. God gives us those rights. They are not invented by the government. We loan those rights to politicians at election time.

In America the people really are in charge. And 220 years ago when these guys cooked up this idea in Philadelphia, it was a radical idea throughout the world, a world at the time that was governed by kings and dictators and oligarchies of sorts. To actually put the people in charge was something that, 220 years ago, was thought to never last very long.

But over time this Congress has given more and more and more authority over to the bureaucracy. Those individuals on the other side of the aisle that we heard just a half hour ago are, in fact they represent the party that has been struggling and fighting this Declaration and Constitution, those documents which are an obstacle to their ideas about governing.

They have given authority away from the people, taken it away from people, given it to the government. They have created a huge welfare state. They refuse to consider any efforts to reduce the tax burden on the American people. I say this, the Democratic party has become the tax collectors for the welfare state.

We are here, and we frighten them. We frighten those folks because we are talking about giving authority back to the people. We are talking about lowering the burden of government when it comes to taxes. We are talking about sunseting all regulatory functions of the Federal Government, in fact, putting a termination date which at some point in time will force every single bureaucrat to account for their actions, to account for their necessity and, in the end, prove their merit and usefulness in order to continue in existence, a huge departure between what they represent on the left hand, what we represent here in the center of American political thought in the conservative Republican Party.

It is the reason they come here and yell and scream and are frightened every night, because we are winning on the street. The American people realize that our pro-freedom, pro-liberty message is resonating with every single American across this country who are fed up with this liberal social way of life. They are looking for liberty and freedom, and that is what we are here to talk about tonight as a Republican Party.

Mr. BRADY. To follow on what the gentleman said, we have been fighting big government since the very beginning. Our Founding Fathers and mothers did know there would be a struggle.

The other day in reading a book on Thomas Jefferson, I stumbled across a letter that he had written during his first term stating that he was hard at work trying to abolish agencies that were no longer needed in our Federal Government. That was at the very infancy. Already the bureaucracy was starting to take hold.

Two of the things I like, I think, also about sunset is that in real life at the State level, when an agency knows that they are coming up for sunset, they are also less likely to write regulations that are so far afield from what Congress or the legislature intended.

As you know, we write a bill that is 10 pages long. An agency writes regulations that fill a thousand pages. The mayor may not have to do what the original intent of Congress or the legislature intended.

But under sunset, when they know they are coming, every agency knows

they are coming back routinely in front of taxpayers, the customers and users of their agencies, and Members of Congress to justify their responsiveness and their service and their quality, it changes things.

Also, under sunset, because we do not just single out the Department of Education or the Department of Commerce or any other program, every agency is held accountable. It puts American taxpayers back into the driver's seat. They have an opportunity when we set these dates to come, not just before Congress to give us their opinion on the quality of service and whether we need them, but through the Internet, through meetings held in their communities, through talking with us, give us a real life value to whether that agency is worth our dollars today or not. As a result, good agencies get better in service, and bad agencies go away as they should.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, to hear this, and again, knowing the deliberate distortion that may be inevitable from those who fear most returning power to the hands of the citizens, I think we need to make this point, again, just to say this: When our friend steps to this floor and advocates the notion of sunset, he does not imply that every bit of government will sunset. He simply asks for increased accountability. That is important. That is one of the notions behind our Congressional Responsibility Act that I would like to outline, Mr. Speaker, for those who join us during this time this evening, and that is also something that I think we can make manifest in rules as we reevaluate our budgetary process.

I am pleased tonight that our Speaker pro tempore is the gentleman from Iowa who joins me with service on the Committee on Ways and Means and also is one of our delegates, if you will, to the Committee on Budget where he does that work. That is one of his other committee assignments, almost a liaison, if you will, between the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Budget.

We have been engaged in some discussions born of my first experience, an epiphany that I had based on experience here during my first term when I served on the Committee on Resources and on one of the subcommittees responsible for national parks. We called in the director of the National Park Service. And sitting next to him was, in essence, the agency's accountant.

□ 2345

Of course here we use a fancy title for accountant. It would be the Inspector General, the person who goes over the receipts, takes a look at the tax dollars that come into the agency.

And I will never forget what transpired on that day. The Inspector General who had the responsibility for the Park Service with the Director of the Park Service sitting alongside told a congressional subcommittee in essence

that the National Park Service could not account for some \$73 million of taxpayer money.

Now I know some folks around here talk about billions and trillions; 73 trillion may not be too much. But I tell you what, to an American family, to the hard-working people in the Sixth District of Arizona and, I submit, to the people in Texas and Colorado and people from coast to coast in Alaska and Hawaii \$73 million is real money. And I suppose for the television cameras it made for great television to have folks kind of rhetorically beat up on the Director of the Park Service, but there was no recourse.

And so what I think we ought to do, and I have talked with our Speaker Pro Tempore this evening, the gentleman from Iowa, and others on the Committee on the Budget, I think we ought to consider a rule that henceforth, when governmental agencies cannot account for taxpayers' funds, as the audits and reports come from their respective inspectors general, then automatically for the next year that amount of money be automatically impounded from that particular agency's administrative account because, as one of my colleagues said on that day to the Director of the Park Service, were he a director of a business, were he chairman of the board of the corporation, what he had done that day would be tantamount to a criminal offense that would land him behind bars. But instead all he endured was the wrath of a few congressional subcommittee members and, I am sure, the disdain of those who joined via videotape that discussion on C-Span.

There must be ways for us to seek accountability.

And so I hope that as we review the budget process with the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, as many of us take a look at this, that we take a look at restoring accountability whether it is through sunseting or through more budgetary rules that require accountability to the citizens of this country or through the Congressional Responsibility Act which says simply this, Mr. Speaker:

That henceforth, when the regulators formulate their regulations, those proposed regulations would not be printed pell-mell in the Federal Register after a certain amount of time for public comment. No, instead those proposed regulations should be returned here to Capitol Hill, to this Chamber and to the Senate, and voted on by the duly elected constitutional representatives so that in that way, Mr. Speaker, those of us who are sent here to represent the people can be held truly accountable.

Now it may come as no great surprise that that notion is fought by a lot of folks, and let us be candid about it, my colleagues. A lot of folks on both sides of the aisle, be they liberal or conservative, do not like that idea because they do not want to take that responsibility. Some folks who are into the

notion of careers in Congress would rather not have that responsibility. But I would submit to you that that is the responsibility we should have.

And to those who say, oh, with a raft of regulations there is too much for Congress to ever cover, you could not do it, I would simply point out it has been my experience in this Chamber, both in this session and certainly in the 104th Congress even with that incredibly ambitious schedule we had some days where we would have ceremonial debate followed by ceremonial votes to name Federal installations after noteworthy Americans, I do not criticize that practice. I simply say this:

If we have the time in the Congress of the United States to engage in those largely ceremonial votes, do we not have time to live up to Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution? Should we not take the time or make the time to do that? And that is what this is about. Despite all the rhetoric and what we can expect, the intentional distortions sadly that will emanate, which I guess is part of the theater of the absurd that often encumbrances Washington, what we are about here, Mr. Speaker, is not a revolution, nor is some on that side who curiously do not believe there is any controlling legal authority would call it a reinvention. We are not about that. Instead what we are about is a restoration, a restoration of constitutional obligations taken on by those to whom power is conferred, a restoration of power in the hands of the citizenry and an acknowledgment that, whether it is regulation or taxation, that the American people work hard for the money they earn. They should be able to hang onto more of it, send less of it here to this city, because, as my colleagues have both pointed out, when the money remains in the hands of Washington, the money is spent.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. You know there are some people here in Washington who really hang their hat on and pretend that they are somehow holding government accountable through the reauthorization process. You know, we talk about that a lot in Washington to a lot of folks back in our districts; they do not know what reauthorization means, but this is when agencies come up for reauthorization or review. It is not a sunset, it is just when the Congress feels like it getting around to looking at an agency again from A to Z, and there is no compelling need to make any meaningful reform. The Congress could decide to do nothing, and the agency will go right on as if no one was looking.

You know that is what many people here celebrate as holding government accountable, but the reauthorization process does not work. And you know you hear about this all the time. The Higher Education Reauthorization Act is going to be coming to the floor here soon, just program after program. We are reauthorizing programs, and that is the only time when this Congress

makes any kind of an attempt to evaluate or review these agencies, but again it does not have the real teeth of sunset or termination dates on these regulatory programs. No bureaucrat is ever forced to come and prove the worth or merit of their program or their job or their function of government to this Congress, and it takes a majority vote voting in the affirmative to repeal a program rather than what ought to occur here is that it takes a majority of votes, majority vote in an affirmative way, to keep a program. And that is what we are trying to turn around and really turn the tables on government to give the leverage to the people of America to pry bad programs out of the system and to strengthen, retain and in fact improve those programs that can be improved and that are worth keeping.

Mr. BRADY. And to follow that point just a little farther we have now, we are entering the 21st century, and every part of our life it seems is changing. Every industry, every profession, every small business has undergone a great deal of change, but government has not; the same programs, the same nonaccountability. In sunset, which is the bill number by the way is H.R. 2939, it is the Federal Sunset Act of 1998, and it has 80 cosponsors on that bill, changes government, gives back control to taxpayers, just demands accountability. And, more importantly, it insists that our agencies serve our taxpayers and their customers.

And people will say, well, wait a minute now. You cannot sunset the EPA.

Well we are not picking winners and losers. Every agency is up for review. But frankly, and I do not agree with a lot that the EPA does, but if we spend money to preserve the environment, I want that money to actually work to clean up a dirty area or a pile of tires.

And people say, well, you cannot sunset the Social Security Administration.

Well, we are not sunsetting the benefit, we are sunsetting who delivers it. And frankly my seniors, many of whom we have a lot of trouble trying to get their benefits to them, frankly they live month to month depending upon those dollars. And their attitude is, if the administration is not going to get their benefits to them on time to those who have earned it, then find someone who will.

□ 2355

Find someone who will get it to them effectively, because the goal here I think in government is not to make ourselves bigger and create more agencies. It is to deliver our services the most cost effective way, to people who need them, and to make sure that a dollar that we spend, that when we take in people's hard-earned tax dollars, actually gets to the people who need them.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Since my colleague from Texas raises the specter of Social

Security by example, I think it is important to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, what transpired here on the Hill today as we take a look at preserving and protecting Social Security for today's seniors and then making that system stronger through innovation and personalization in the days ahead.

It brings to mind the fact that, mindful as we are of the time and the few minutes, about 5 minutes that remain, for us to share with the American people tonight Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of the fact that during this recess I will be back in the 6th District of Arizona with town halls talking to seniors about how best to preserve Social Security, how best to preserve that trust fund, and then looking to the baby-boom generation and those of the third millennium, or the Generation Next-Agers, or beyond, to see how best to deal with the problem.

I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased about the Social Security task force that we have assembled in the 6th Congressional District of Arizona with people who are very, very interested, who have a stake in this, as today's seniors on today's program, as soon to be seniors, as baby-boomers, and as Generation Nexters, or third millennia children. They are working together to try and take a look at this system. I eagerly await their report and to hear from the people as we return back to listen to our constituents to decide how best to solve problems.

Again, I cannot help but comment on the irony of those who preceded us in this chamber, who had invented almost out of whole cloth, but instead out of deliberate distortion, scare tactics about a legitimate question of tax reform. And I think, Mr. Speaker, to couch that properly, we should say this: I could not help but note the irony that the three who stood here in this chamber had embraced just a few years before a soup-to-nuts plan for socialized medicine that was derived in a back room behind closed doors down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, a program that was doomed to failure because it was never debated by the American people, nor shared.

So we do not shrink from the notion of debate; we welcome it. Whether on Social Security or tax policy, or over-regulation or overtaxation, we welcome debate and decisions. But we want to hear from all the people, not lock people away and sequester them behind closed doors and then emerge with some Rube Goldbergesque scheme. Instead, it is the basic goodness and wisdom of the people which will prevail and which I look forward to hearing in my town hall meetings when I return home.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I want to wrap-up by summarizing a number of things we have discussed in a very quick way, and that is we really are talking about a great number of ideas to shrink the size of the Federal Government, to return authority and wealth and power

back to the people, and basically to give more freedom and liberty to Americans throughout the country wherever they may be.

But the reality is, there is about two minutes left until the end of April Fool's Day here in Washington, D.C. in the eastern time zone, which means that in 14 days, a little over 14 days now, at about this time, American taxpayers throughout the country are going to be lining up to get to their Post Office to file their tax returns in time in order to stay within the law of the Internal Revenue Service Tax Code.

I hope they will be thinking about this conversation tonight, and maybe contrasting the difference between our Republican message of freedom and liberty and lower taxes and the Democrat message of more government and no tax cuts, no tax cuts.

The tax collectors for the welfare State, as you have pointed out in the quote you brought here tonight, have stated right here on this floor just a few weeks ago that the fact is that Democrats are not for tax cuts. That is the real difference between the two parties. We really are looking for ways to liberate the American people, to lower tax rates.

Here is something I want to point out. Families paid 5 percent of their income in Federal taxes in 1934. Today, the average family pays 20 percent of its annual income to the Federal Government, the highest since World War II. That is no April Fool's Day joke.

Right now the average American family pays about 40 percent of their total income in State, Federal and local taxes; 40 percent. That is no April fool's Day joke either.

Our goal and our vision in general terms and over a broader context is to lower the effective tax rate on the American family to no more than 25 percent. That is something we are not joking about either. We are quite serious about it.

We will be back at this microphone time and time again talking about this vision of freedom and liberty, lower taxes and less government. I thank the Speaker for recognizing us today, and allowing us to participate in this special order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 8:15 p.m. on account of physical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MASCARA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NADLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. WHITFIELD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 750. An act to consolidate certain mineral interests in the National Grasslands in Billings County, North Dakota, through the exchange of Federal and private mineral interests to enhance land management capabilities and environmental and wildlife protection, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 257, 105th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 21, 1998, for morning hour debates.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 257, the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 21, 1998, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8341. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Specifically Approved States Authorized to Receive Mares and Stallions Imported from Regions Where CEM Exists [Docket No. 97-104-1] received March 30, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8342. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the medical condition of members of the Armed Forces who are de-

ployed outside the United States as part of a contingency or combat operation, pursuant to Public Law 105-85; to the Committee on National Security.

8343. A letter from the Deputy Director for Policy and Programs, Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Community Development Financial Institutions Fund; Notice of Funds Availability (NOFA) Inviting Applications for the Community Development Financial Institutions Program—Core Component [No. 981-0154] received March 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8344. A letter from the Deputy Director for Policy and Program, Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Community Development Financial Institutions Fund; Notice of Funds Availability (NOFA) Inviting Applications for the Community Development Financial Institutions Program Technical Assistance—Technical Assistance Component [No. 982-0154] received March 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8345. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Odometer Disclosure Requirements; Exemptions [Docket No. 87-09, Notice 16] (RIN: 2127-AG83) received March 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8346. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection [Docket No. NHTSA-97-3191; Notice 2] (RIN: 2127-AF66) received March 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8347. A letter from the Acting Director, Minority Business Development Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Solicitation of Minority Business Development Center Applications for Miami/Ft. Lauderdale, Raleigh/Durham, San Antonio, El Paso, Statewide New Mexico, Philadelphia, Williamsburg, Seattle, Honolulu and San Jose [Docket No. 980320072-8072-01] received March 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8348. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Statement of the Commission Regarding Use of Internet Web Sites to Offer Securities, Solicit Securities Transactions or Advertise Investment Services Offshore [Release Nos. 33-7516, 34-39779, 1A-1710, IC-23071] received March 24, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8349. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendments to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations [22 CFR Part 121] received March 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

8350. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting the 1996 annual report entitled "International Exchange and Training Activities of the United States Government"; to the Committee on International Relations.

8351. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the final version of the Department's FY 1999 Annual Performance Plan (APP), pursuant to Public Law 103-62; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8352. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule—Amendment to Clarify